In item 3 on page 2 of the Office action, claims 1-4, 7, and 16-18 have been rejected as being anticipated by Hatanaka (5,587,598) under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 defines a step of subsequent to connecting the terminal of the first integrated circuit to the terminal of the package, severing the electrically conductive connection between the terminal and the signal terminal of the first integrated circuit using an energy pulse. Hatanaka severs electrical connections before connecting terminals to the terminal pins of the housing (See column 4, lines 12-13).

Further, that step specifies the severing the electrically conductive connection between the terminal (of the first integrated circuit) and the signal terminal of the first integrated circuit. Hatanaka does not teach severing a connection between such terminals of an integrated circuit.

Claim 1 also defines a step of forming an electrically conductive connection between the terminal (of the first integrated circuit) and the signal terminal of the first integrated circuit. Hatanaka does not teach forming an electrically conductive connection between any such terminals.

Further, claim 1 defines a step of electrically connecting the signal terminal of the first integrated circuit to the terminal of the second integrated circuit. Hatanaka does not teach providing an integrated circuit with a terminal (signal terminal) that is connected to a terminal of another integrated circuit. Hatanaka merely teaches connecting the provided terminals of the sole integrated circuit to the housing pins.

Claim 1 also defines a step of electrically connecting a signal terminal of a first integrated circuit to a terminal of a second integrated circuit. Hatanaka does not teach such a step, but rather teaches protecting an integrated circuit during the production thereof, specifically, during the wafer process, against damages caused by discharges (See column 1, lines 44-59, for example).

In item 5 on page 4 of the Office action, claims 5 and 6 have been rejected as being obvious over Hatanaka (5,587,598) in view of Kuriyama (5,682,057) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Even if it would have been obvious to combine the references, the invention as defined by these claims would not have been obtained for the reasons specified above in regard to claim 1.

In item 6 on page 5 of the Office action, claims 8-11 have been rejected as being obvious over Hatanaka (5,587,598) in view of Bozso et al. (5,760,478) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 8 defines a step of forming an electrically conductive connection between the first and second terminal pads of the first integrated circuit, and this is not shown in the references.

Claim 8 also defines a step of severing the electrically conductive connection between the first and second terminal pads of the first integrated circuit using an energy pulse, and this is not suggested by the references.

Claim 8 also defines a step of electrically joining at least one of the first and second terminal pads of the first integrated circuit to one of the first and second terminal pads of the second integrated circuit. The references do not suggest electrically connecting a terminal pad of one integrated circuit to a terminal pad of another integrated circuit, but rather only suggest connecting a terminal pad to a housing pin.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either

show or suggest the features of claims 1 or 8. Claims 1 and 8 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1 or 8, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-11 and 16-18 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, he is respectfully requested to telephone counsel so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of two-months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of $400.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and

Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark P. Weichselbaum
Reg. No. 43,248

For Applicant

MPW:cgm

November 5, 2001

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101